

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks. No additional fee is required for this Amendment as the number of independent claims has not changed, and the total number of claims is less than originally filed.

Request for Telephone Interview

Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (847) 490-1400 to schedule a telephone interview, to discuss the merits of this Patent Application.

Amendment to the Claims

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate elements of original Claim 31. Support for this Amendment can be found on page 10, first paragraph, of the Substitute Specification. Claim 31 has been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended to further describe the sleeve element, which holds the insertion element within the base body. Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify the insertion of the insertion element, as requested by the Examiner. Support for this Amendment can be found on page 3

Serial No.: 10/559,149

of the Substitute Specification. No new matter has been added to the claims by this Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-35 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for the reasons set forth at page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to follow the original disclosure, such as at page 3, second paragraph. Applicants believe that the above Amendment and comments overcome the rejection of Claims 1-35 and 37.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 - Pellaton

The rejection of Claims 1-2, 21, 23-25, 27, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pellaton, U.S. Patent 2,982,325, is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 31. Pellaton does not disclose or suggest the limitations of Claim 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 - Salakari

The rejection of Claims 1-2, 23-25, 27, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Salakari, U.S. Patent 3,884,284, is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 31. Salakari does not disclose or suggest the limitations of Claim 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 - Nurmi et al.

The rejection of Claims 1-2, 21, 23, 25, 27, 35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nurmi et al., International Publication WO 91/00185, is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 31. Nurmi does not disclose or suggest the limitations of Claim 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 - Russia '585

The rejection of Claims 1-4, 20-21, 23-25, 27, 31, 35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Russian Publication 2117585, is respectfully traversed.

As amended, the invention of Claim 1 requires an insertion element to be inserted into the base body and for the base body to include a receiver section which is determined by a detent formed as a protrusion between the receiver section and the flange of the base body. The Office Action alleges that Russian ‘585 discloses a “detent” between the lower part 20 and the upper part 19 in Fig. 12. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The alleged detent of Russian ‘585 is not equivalent to the detent of the claimed invention because it is not an element of the base body. In Fig. 12 of Russian ‘585, the insertion element 5 is inserted into element 3, however element 3 does not include a detent. Further, the alleged detent of Russian ‘585 is an element of the bushing 19, 20, but the bushing 19, 20 does not receive the insertion element 5. Thus, the alleged detent is not equivalent to the detent of the claimed invention and Russian ‘585 does not disclose or suggest all elements of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Furthermore, the sleeve element of Applicants’ claimed invention is pressed on the receiver section and has a dimension that when pressed on the receiver section fixes and holds the insertion element inserted into the recess of the base body. The Russian ‘585 discloses a metal hollow rod 3 which fixes and holds the head

portion 5, and does not disclose or suggest the use of Applicants' pressed-on housing to fix and hold an insertion element.

For at least these reasons, the claimed invention is patentable over Russian '585.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 - Russia '585 in view of Mironov et al.

The rejection of Claims 5-8, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Russia '585 in view of Mironov et al., International Publication WO 99/56976, is respectfully traversed. Claims 5-8, and 22 depend from Claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 - Russia '585 in view of Mironov et al. in further view of Nurmi et al. or Walrave et al.

The rejection of Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Russia '585 in view of Mironov et al. in further view of Nurmi et al., International Publication WO 91/00185, is respectfully traversed. Claim 26 depends from Claim 1 and is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 - Finnish 861/64 in view of Russia '585

The rejection of Claims 1-4, 20-21, 23-25, 27, 31, 35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Finnish Publication 861/64 in view of Russia '585, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 31. The Office Action alleges that Russia '585 discloses a detent. As discussed above, the alleged detent of Russia '585 is not equivalent to the detent of the claimed invention. Further, Finish 861/64 does not disclose or suggest a detent. The combination also does not provide or suggest Applicants' recited pressed-on sleeve element which fixes and holds the insertion element within the receiver section. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Applicants intend to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not addressed or resolved in this response, Applicants' undersigned attorney requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Serial No.: 10/559,149

Applicants sincerely believe that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully request early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Swanson
Registration No. 48,498

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road
Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60169
(847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403